

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claims 1, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,458,254 to *Miyagawa et al.* (“*Miyagawa*”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants amend claims 1, 10, and 11 to better clarify the claims and not for reasons of patentability. New claims 12 and 13 are added to provide an alternative scope of protection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10, and 11-13 are allowable and request further consideration.

All Subject Matter Complies With 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Miyagawa*. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed for the following reasons.

Miyagawa shows a method for manufacturing a liquid jet recording head. See Abstract of *Miyagawa*.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Miyagawa* does not disclose at least the “material of the resinous base is the same as that of the resin body, and the resinous base supports at least a portion of the resin body,” as recited in claims 1, 10, and 11. In the present invention, the surface of the resin body forming the ink chamber discharge section can be flatly formed without removing the resinous base in the manufacturing of the inkjet recording head. However, *Miyagawa* does not act to restrict the “cracking caused by a difference between coefficients of

thermal expansions of the substrate 12 and the resin having photo-sensitivity 42 (and the base 16),” as stated in the specification at page 14, lines 17-22.

Moreover, *Miyagawa* does not even identify the problem of “cracking” due to differing coefficients of thermal expansion and embedding “a resinous base” as a way to mitigate such cracking. In fact, *Miyagawa* does not discuss the recited features that address the above-mentioned problem at all. As such, *Miyagawa* cannot anticipate the present invention.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because *Miyagawa* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 10, and 11. Additionally, claims 12 and 13 which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable at least because their base claim is allowable, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Date: September 22, 2004

CUSTOMER NO.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000